

---

Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
of the  
Southern California Association of Governments

May 17, 2007

***Minutes***

---

**THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY THE PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) MEETING. THE AUDIO CASSETTE TAPE OF THE ACTUAL MEETING IS AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING IN SCAG'S OFFICE.**

The P&P TAC held its meeting at the SCAG Headquarters in Los Angeles. The meeting was called to order by Ty Schuiling, Chair, SANBAG.

**Members Present:**

Ty Schuiling, Chair	SANBAG
Miles, Mitchell, Vice-Chair	LADOT
Shefa Bhuiyan	Caltrans-District 8
Deborah Diep	CDR / CSU Fullerton
Dana Gabbard	So. Ca. Transit Advocates
Bill Gayk	Riverside County TLMA
Lori Huddlesston	LACMTA
Jack Humphrey	Gateway Cities COG
Paula McHargue	LAWA
Catherine McMillan	CVAG
David Mootchnik	So. Cal. Commuters Forum
Ian Pari	City of Santa Clarita
Tracy Sato	City of Anaheim
Gail Shiimoto-Lohr	Orange County COG
John Stesney	LACMTA
Jim Stewart	SCCED
Tony Van Haagen	Caltrans-District 7
Carla Walecka	Transportation Corridor Agencies
Dianna Watson	Caltrans-District 7
Danny Wu	City of Anaheim
Michael Litschi	OCTA
Brian Liu	LACMTA
Brad McAllester	LACMTA
Linda Taira	Caltrans-District 7
Diane Forte	Environment Now
Aileen Igermel	Caltrans-District 12
Lisa Haroy	City of Santa Clarita
David Sosa	Caltrans-District 7
Shefa Bhuiyan	Caltrans-District 8

**Via Conference Call:**

Dr. Paul Fagan	Caltrans-District 8
Brian Kuhn	City of Palmdale

**Via Conference Call:**

Michelle Merino	IVAG
Kathy Williams	IVAG
Jeff Weir	Air Resources Board
Lisa Poe	SANBAG
Doug Bilse	City of Camarillo

**Via Video Conference:**

Shirley Medina	RCTC
----------------	------

**SCAG Staff:**

Naresh Amatya	
Bob Huddy	
Andre Darmanin	
Peter Brandenburg	
Shawn Kuk	
Annie Nam	
Betty Mann	
Hasan Ikharta	
Jonathan Nadler	
David Rubinow	
Tarek Hatata	System Metrics (consultant)
Bill McCullough	System Metrics (consultant)
Sarah Catz	Sub-Consultant to System Metrics
Cheryl Stecher	Sub-Consultant to System Metrics

**1.0 CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Ty Schuiling, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:15 am. Introductions were made.

**2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

There were no public comments.

**3.0 CONSENT CALENDAR**

**3.1 Approval Items**

**3.1.1 Approve Minutes of March 15, 2007**

*Members requested the following changes be made to the minutes:*

- Ty Schuiling, Chair requested the following revisions:
  - Page 5, paragraph 1, of the minutes as follows: “Mr. Schuiling added that the NB 15 in the PM over the Cajon Pass is also bad with

two freeways merging into one and very high truck volumes.” This should refer to two freeways merging into one and is really the Devore Interchange, the I-15/I-215 Junction.

- Page 5, paragraph 2, “Mr. Schuiling questioned the data regarding the 214215 segment between the 10 and 60 crossing the San Bernardino/Riverside county line.
- Page 5, paragraph 3, “Mr. Schuiling added that Caltrans just did a ~~shot~~ SHOPP project...”
- Page 6, paragraph 2, “Mr. Mitchell suggested agendizing for the next TAC meeting a discussion on funding allocation methodology and how actions taken by the TAC may impact funding determinations.” This item is not listed on today’s agenda and should be agendized on an upcoming meeting.
- Page 6, paragraph 2, “Mr. Schuiling inquired on whether or not the RTP will be developed in line with specific performance objectives and that this should be agendized for a later TAC meeting.” This item is also not included in today’s agenda and should be included in the upcoming agenda.
- Page 9, item 4.4, paragraph 2, line 3, “...efforts that used to fall into the SHOPP per SB4035 are no longer available.”
- Gail Shimoto-Lohr requested the following changes be made:
  - Page 2, item 3.1.1 as follows: ~~distinct and~~ **Ms. Diep inquired** if there is **a to be a distinct** RHNA database that is developed, reflecting any revisions to the socio-economic assumptions resulting from any appeals or revisions, ~~should be a~~ **that is** separate and distinct **from the RTP database**. The pure projections should be utilized in the RTP.
  - Page 7, paragraph 3, “...and if there are successful appeals **through which** those housing units would then be distributed ...”
  - Page 8, line 1, “...Transportation Corridor Agencies (TCA)...”
  - Page 9, line 1, “...assumptions **on Prop 42 and Prop 1B local subventions** be revisited because the cities are using all of this to deal with resurfacing and local projects”

*Motion to approve the minutes of the March 15, 2007 meeting contingent upon the changes noted above was moved (Mitchell), seconded (Diep), and unanimously approved. An electronic copy of the revised minutes is available on the SCAG website ([www.scag.ca.gov/rptac/index.htm](http://www.scag.ca.gov/rptac/index.htm)).*

## **4.0 INFORMATION ITEMS**

### **4.1 Air Quality Conformity**

Jonathan Nadler, SCAG, presented members with a general overview of air quality conformity requirements and what it means for the RTP.

Mr. Nadler explained that the federal Clean Air Act (CAA) sets national ambient air quality standards and attainment and air plan submittal dates by pollutant based on specific designations of non-attainment areas. Slides were presented identifying the numerous air quality related designations. The first map showed the boundaries of the four air basins within the SCAG region as follows: the South Central Coast, South Coast, Mojave Desert, and the Salton Sea air basin. Mr. Nadler explained that the geographic boundaries of the air basins are not the same as the non-attainment areas or the air districts. The five air districts within the region were identified as follows: Ventura County APCD, Antelope Valley AQMD, South Coast AQMD, Mojave Desert AQMD, and Imperial County APCD. Within the air basins and air districts, there are five federal ozone non-attainment areas, five PM10 areas, one PM2.5 area (South Coast Air Basin), one CO area (the South Coast area was just recently re-designated as a maintenance area for CO), and finally one maintenance area for NO2. Mr. Nadler stated that the technical work for conformity requires that all of the non-conformity areas be addressed.

Mr. Nadler briefly explained federal conformity requirements, including the process in which motor vehicle emission budgets are derived. First, local air quality management plans (AQMP) are prepared in response to federal and state requirements, which incorporates the state and federal control strategy and prepares the State Implementation Plan (SIP). Once a local AQMP is prepared and adopted, it is submitted to the Air Resources Board (ARB). Ultimately the SIP is submitted to EPA for approval. Mr. Nadler emphasized that there is a SIP for each non attainment pollutant for each area.

In terms of how this impacts the conformity process, Mr. Nadler explained that all federally supported highway and transit projects are required to conform to a SIP. The motor vehicle emissions budgets that are established in the SIP set permissible upper limits for transportation activities. These apply to the non-attainment and maintenance areas for transportation related pollutants. Each pollutant and their precursors have emission budgets.

Mr. Nadler added that SCAG receives the emissions budgets from each air district in conjunction with ARB. The budgets in the 2007 AQMP were based on SCAG's 2004 RTP as updated with current socio-economic data.

Mr. Nadler stated that an interim model, which is intended to replicate the upcoming new transportation model as best as possible, was used as SCAG's input into the region's AQMPs. Once the new transportation model is available, we can better assess the adequacy of the budgets.

Mr. Nadler then pointed out that ozone SIPs are due in June and the PM2.5 SIP for South Coast is due in April 2008. Considering the EPA typically takes about three months to approve the SIP once it is submitted, and that staff is intending to release the draft RTP in October, we are working within some time constraints. The conformity determination does not need to be made upon the release of the draft but is required for plan adoption, by which time we anticipate having the budgets in place.

Mr. Nadler continued with regard to the performance of the next RTP. As explained previously, emission budgets are being set based on the 2004 RTP. The general goal of the 2008 RTP would be to at least maintain existing conditions or improve on them if possible. The performance of the 2008 RTP will have to be assessed later, once we

know exactly what projects will be included in the plan. Staff is continuing to work diligently to ensure that we meet all of our budgets and ultimately that we have a conforming RTP.

Mr. Ty Schuiling, SANBAG, inquired about SCAG's responsibility in reducing mobile source emissions levels versus the responsibilities of other air quality regulatory agencies. Mr. Nadler responded by stating that the California Health and Safety Code requires that SCAG provide the portion of the South Coast AQMP which includes transportation strategies and transportation control measures (TCMs). TCMs are projects that are intended to reduce congestion as opposed to reducing exhaust emissions. Exhaust emissions are the responsibility of the state and federal government. An ongoing issue is that the state cannot assign emission reductions to federal sources (e.g. trains, ships, planes) which make up a large part of the air quality problem.

Mr. Schuiling asked what level of emission reduction was attributed to the 2004 RTP and what level of emission reduction appears likely to be asked of the 2008 RTP.

Mr. Nadler noted that the region is facing significant challenges in terms of demonstrating attainment and that any benefits that can be gained from the RTP would be welcome. In terms of the overall reductions that the transportation plan gives relative to the reductions assumed by other agencies is minimal. The primary reason is that fleets are substantially cleaner than they were in the past such that congestion relief strategies provide only nominal emission reductions.

Mr. Tony Van Haagen, Caltrans District 7, inquired whether the interim model was run using the 5-loop method which would result in higher VMT relative to the previous model method.

Mr. Nadler stated that the 5-loop modeling method was the agreed upon approach through stakeholder discussions and that staff has followed what was considered to be the best practices.

Mr. Van Haagen stated that he had not seen the VMT results and inquired about its availability. Mr. Schuiling requested that staff make available the results of the interim model to the TAC.

In reference to SCAG's efforts relative to goods movement control measures, Mr. Brad McAllester, LACMTA, mentioned that Maglev was not modeled in the previous RTP as it was considered a privately funded project and that there was an attempt to remain sensitive to concerns over the project becoming a priority for federal funds and competing with TCM1. Mr. McAllester asked if staff could clarify the difference between this control measure and the TCMs. Adding that if the goods movement control measures move forward with significant emissions impacts associated with them, and if the private funding that had been assumed does not become available, do they become federal funding priorities as a TCM? Mr. Schuiling asked staff to begin with a description of this emerging TCM referred to by Mr. McAllester.

Mr. Nadler responded by briefly describing SCAG's proposed goods movement measures which include an alternative freight movement system and truck-only lanes. These projects are being developed as part of SCAG's on-going Goods Movement Program which is intended to enable the region to improve the health and well-being of our communities, while more efficiently accommodating freight movement through

the region to the economic benefit of Southern California and the rest of the Nation. The proposed alternative freight movement system would use the same track as envisioned for a regional passenger movement system. The business case being developed assumes that the system would be partially self financing by the users who gain benefit from the efficiencies of the system. The truck-only lane envisions moving two-containers per vehicle. There is no intent to have these publicly financed or to establish them as TCMs that require timely implementations or approvals. These control measures were put on the table to address the 74 ton per day NOx shortfall to meet the PM2.5 standard, and are being proposed with assumption that ARB will backstop the reductions associated with these mobile sources if the projects are not executed in the proposed timeframe.

Mr. McAllester stated that he appreciated SCAG's efforts in this area but that there needs to be ways that SCAG can clarify the intent of such measures so that they do not become a priority for federal transportation funds should the private sector funds not materialize. He stated that there may have been strategies in the past that were not associated with emissions targets as part of the SIP.

Mr. Hasan Ikharta, SCAG, reiterated Mr. Nadler's point that there is no intent for these measures to compete for funding priorities on the part of the commissions and that they are proposed as to be backstopped by ARB. What we have on the table at this time is a combination of measures between ARB, AQMD and SCAG to address the shortfall of about 74 tons of PM2.5 in the SIP. The two measure discussed by Mr. Nadler would only account for approximately 20 tons. SCAG's intent was to deal with the shortfalls of the SIP and would welcome ideas to achieve this. The intent to have the commissions and SCAG agree on an action plan to move forward and that discussions would need to take place in moving forward.

Mr. McAllester asked if the South Coast AQMP was scheduled for approval on June 1 and if that would result in the goods movement measure becoming a transportation control measure.

Mr. Ikharta stated that if the air plan is approved on June 1<sup>st</sup>, it would be submitted to the ARB who can then modify the locally submitted plan.

Mr. McAllester stated that discussions regarding the goods movement measures would need to take place in the next week or so.

Mr. Ikharta commented that the ARB would take some time to accept the air plan before submitting the SIP to the EPA. The EPA would also need to find that the SIP is financially constrained and that it meets attainment.

Mr. McAllester encouraged that a discussion with the counties take place in the next few days.

Mr. Ikharta commented on the magnitude of the goods movement issue. He added that SCAG is about a month away from signing an MOU with the region's six county transportation commissions, the two ports, ARB, EPA, the Interior Trade Commission and the USDOT.

Mr. Miles Mitchell, LADOT, requested that staff explain electrifying existing rail capacity and high speed rail in terms of the new goods movement control measures being proposed for the 2008 RTP.



Mr. Ikharta stated that a study was conducted by SCAG about 20 years ago to analyze electrification of existing rail tracks. This study is relevant in that NOx contributions from freight trucks diminish while rail and ship traffic continue to increase. To really address the emission issues when 50% of the cargo is being carried by rail, you would need to electrify to get to zero emission. The cost to electrify is estimated at 3 to 5 billion dollars. This control measure assumes that rail services in our region will be electric by 2014.

Mr. Mitchell referred to a proposal presented at the Maglev Task Force meeting (May 10, 2007) that included a description of a new Maglev line from the port to Union Station, also connecting with the IOS line (passenger and cargo) out to Ontario. Mr. Mitchell asked if the system described above is part of the new goods movement control measure that is being proposed.

Mr. Ikharta commented that the region has relied on black box approach to meet air quality standards in the past. He added that there has been an abundance of research findings in recent years documenting the negative public health impacts of emissions to the extent of 5,400 premature deaths annually and an additional 140,000 asthma cases.

Mr. Schuiling commented that the federal government has prioritized the need to establish the region as the nation's premiere gateway for imported goods while it has been unwilling to adequately regulate the emissions that are a result of moving those goods. He added that the intent to try and address this issue by way of this measure, which is felt to be essentially impossible by transportation professionals, may result in the region being unable to move forward with the regionally significant projects that would add capacity. Mr. Schuiling noted that revenues generated by the county sales tax measures and funding from STIP, STP, and CMAC all have plans associated with them. He reiterated the concern that if the private funding for the measure does not materialize, there would be no project and there would be no recourse.

Some discussion continued in regard to the role of the AQMD in addressing this issue. Mr. Schuiling commented that the AQMD was prepared to submit a plan that specifies actions that can be taken at the discretion of the state and federal agencies to achieve the required emissions reductions. Mr. Ikharta stated that the AQMD does not have measures to close the emissions gap and that the ARB has been asked to back stop or provide an alternative for the goods movement measures. Regulating wood burning fireplaces in the region has been discussed by AQMD but this measure would still not be enough.

Mr. Schuiling commented that the stakeholders represented in the TAC have had no discussion of this issue to this point in time.

Mr. Ikharta stated that he believed Mark Pisano had discussed this issue with the county commission CEOs.

Mr. Schuiling stated that Mr. Pisano had not discussed specifications of the freight control measure and that the discussion taking place today is the first.

There was a question as to whether or not the high speed rail on the IOS would also become a control measure. Staff confirmed that this would be the case.

Mr. Mitchell commented that there are numerous studies regarding this technology that are currently underway but are yet to be completed. He added that SCAG is asking the region to accept this control measure despite not having completed a thorough review and analysis.

Mr. McAllester stated that the goods movement control measure has not gone before the Transportation Conformity Working Group in a meaningful manner.

A question was asked regarding the approximate cost of the two measures. The cost was estimated at 40 billion dollars which includes the IOS, the Maglev, and the line from the port to the IOS.

Michael Litschi, OCTA, asked about the general scope of the goods movement control measures and whether the region would be mandated to implement them or included in the AQMP. Mr. Ikharta stated that if we take credit for the measures as part of the attainment demonstration in the AQMP but do not implement it, then the reductions would need to be made up some how. Dana Gabbard, Southern California Transit Advocates, evoked the Brown Act and requested that the TAC vote to add this discussion as an item to the agenda as an emergency issue. Mr. Schuiling stated that the current discussion was relevant to the air quality conformity item and that a vote would not be necessary.

Mr. Mitchell asked if these goods movement measures had been brought before the Transportation and Communications Committee or the Regional Council as a TCM.

Mr. Ikharta asked to correct a statement made earlier. He stated that SCAG is not submitting the goods movement projects to the AQMD as TCMs. TCMs are those projects that reduce congestion and have funding in the first two years of the RTIP. TCMs must meet timely implementation requirements and if they are unable to be delivered, must be substituted for. These strategies are being submitted as control measures with the assumption that they will be backstopped by ARB. An air quality workshop in April of this year was devoted to the air quality issue and a vote on the resolution was taken at the General Assembly earlier this month. The vote was to submit the SCAG portion of the South Coast AQMP to the district and included the two transportation strategies.

Mr. McAllester moved to convey to SCAG management the concerns expressed today regarding the inclusion of the goods movement strategies into the air plan and to ask SCAG executive management to have an immediate meeting with the county transportation commission executive management. Mr. Schuiling seconded the motion.

Mr. Mitchell asked whether or not there were any alternatives available to the goods movement strategies being proposed to meet the emissions gap. Mr. Ikharta stated that neither SCAG nor AQMD has an alternative. The ARB has proposed a winter-time ban on wood burning from fireplaces but this would not be enough.

There was some discussion of the multi-county goods movement study currently being developed. There was some discussion as to whether or not the study recommends dedicated truck lanes for longer combination vehicles. The study does identify dedicated high speed clean freight corridors but does not specify the technology. The study also has an implementation horizon of 2030.



Mr. Mitchell suggested an amendment to the motion made earlier by Mr. McAllester. He requested that TAC staff prepare a memo to be distributed to the TAC and the CTC executives as soon as possible summarizing today's discussion.

Mr. McAllester rephrased his motion to include the development of a white paper detailing all of the ramifications, alternatives and discussions from the meeting by the end of next week.

Mr. Schuiling stated that the intent is to generate a meeting of the executives well before any action is taken on the AQMP. Mr. Schuiling seconded Mr. McAllester's amended motion.

Gail Shiimoto-Lohr, OCCOG, noted that AQMD and SCAG staff have previously emphasized the inability to get the state and feds to appropriately regulate the mobile sources within their respective jurisdictions. She inquired about the effort for a call to action to be able to make those agencies take their fair share of the issue and challenges so that the South Coast Air Basin and the region would not be placed in this situation.

Mr. Ikharta commented that the EPA would not be very responsive and expressed reservations in anticipating that appropriate measures be put forth from the federal level.

Mr. Mitchell asked whether staff will be able to distribute the requested white paper by May 25<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Ikharta stated that he is not authorized to have a white paper be distributed without receiving approval from SCAG's policy committees. He stated that the meeting of the executives will take place and that a summary of the discussion from the meeting will be distributed as well. The TAC's recommendation will be forwarded to the TCC with the meeting between SCAG and the CTCs to take place as an immediate step. Staff will be able to provide a description of the issue but will not be able to send an official white paper at this point.

Carla Walecka, Transportation Corridor Agencies, asked that the meeting minutes be forwarded ASAP even if it is in draft form.

Mr. Mitchell moved to amend the motion to have the minutes prepared by the end of next week (May 25<sup>th</sup>) and distributed to the TAC. Motion was unanimously approved.

*Per committee's request, a portion of the May 17 draft meeting minutes were distributed to the P&P TAC via email on May 24, 2007.*

#### 4.2 RTP Update Schedule and Strategy

Naresh Amatya, SCAG, discussed the RTP update timeline and major milestones. A graphic timeline was distributed for reference. The schedule identifies key efforts, proposed meetings and action dates through the release of the draft in October 2007. It also includes timeframes for the public participation and environmental review efforts. Staff requested assistance from the committee in identifying outreach opportunities. Mr. Amatya explained that the intent was to go to every COG and respective technical advisory committees at least once before the October release.

Mr. Amatya explained that the primary work with respect to the ongoing needs assessment process will be moving forward with preliminary baseline analysis. He

added that there is some urgency with the next phase which is the alternatives development. August and September were stated as being the timeframe in which the referred alternative will need to be established. Staff anticipates a maximum of two to three alternatives that will eventually require a full evaluation. Mr. Amatya reported that staff is continuing to refine the finance sections of the RTP update and is currently refining project costs information. An assessment of the funding gap and alternative funding mechanisms are to follow. Mr. Amatya added that due to time conflicts between the RTP update schedule and the new AQMP adoption schedule, staff anticipates releasing the draft RTP with emissions budgets from the draft AQMP. The hope is that by the time that we are ready to adopt the RTP, we will have an adopted SIP budget that has been adopted by the EPA.

Tarek Hatata, System Metrics, reiterated the major milestones that were discussed by Mr. Amatya. He stated that the needs assessment process is intended to lead toward developing a list of gaps or deficiencies that have not been addressed and ultimately to develop those alternatives that attempt to address those gaps. Mr. Hatata stated that the discussions regarding alternative scenarios will also involve innovative financing and other revenue sources. Growth visioning scenarios will also function as a major input in the discussions to come. Potential changes to the transportation system as a result (baseline and/or Tier 2 projects) will be vetted through the P&P TAC and will be a cooperative effort. Mr. Hatata added that the preferred alternative is expected to be developed by September. Mr. Hatata emphasized that the path to developing the preferred alternative may require more frequent meetings in the coming months and that the attendance and input from the committee members will be essential.

#### 4.3 RTP Baseline Systems Gaps / Deficiencies

Tarek Hatata, System Metrics, gave a brief update on transportation system preservation. Mr. Hatata referred to the adopted 2004 RTP goal<sup>1</sup> of preserving and ensuring a *sustainable* regional transportation system and the policy to ensure safety and adequate maintenance and efficiency of the existing transportation system<sup>2</sup>. He added that language in SAFETEA-LU also emphasizes preservation.

Mr. Hatata spoke, aided by a slide presentation on the topic<sup>3</sup>. System Metrics (consultant) has begun analyzing the state highway system in the preservation context. Mr. Hatata emphasized the urgency of preservation needs and the exponential growth in terms of costs if the preservation needs remain unaddressed.

More specifically, Mr. Hatata noted that 6.6 billion dollars would be included in the RTP for preservation and operations investments to bring the region's deteriorating system back to appropriate levels. He explained that although the recently adopted SHOPP allocates 55% of its funding to preservation needs, due to the substantial increase in recent years to construction costs, current expenditure levels are actually below what was projected in the 2004 RTP. In this sense, the gap is continuing to grow for the region in addressing our preservation needs. Mr. Hatata noted that the

---

<sup>1</sup> Adopted 2004 RTP Goal #3 appears in its original text on page 79 of the 2004 RTP document.

<sup>2</sup> Adopted 2004 RTP Policy #2 appears in its original text on page 80 of the 2004 RTP document.

<sup>3</sup> [http://scag.ca.gov/rtptac/pdf/2007/tac051707\\_UpdatedTransportationSystemPreservation.pdf](http://scag.ca.gov/rtptac/pdf/2007/tac051707_UpdatedTransportationSystemPreservation.pdf)

SHOPP reaffirms this increasing gap as the state-wide need has been updated to \$42 billion from the previous \$27.9 billion.

Ty Schuiling, SANBAG, commented on the limitations to Prop 42 funds with respect to it being accessed to address preservation needs. Some general discussion followed with regard to increased construction costs in recent years and California's concrete supply shortage.

Gail Shiomoto-Lohr, OCCOG, stated that there may be a need to move Prop 42 and Prop 1B funding allocations out of the RTP finance model and treat them as an assumption to free up that money and give locals the opportunity to address their respective preservation needs for the state system. Mr. Hatata explained that staff has included the Prop 42 and 1B funding in the revenue and will be treating the preservation needs as part of the overall cost. Preservation needs for local road systems can be submitted to staff and will also be included in the cost. Annie Nam, SCAG, clarified that what was being referred to was the gas tax subvention funds for local streets and roads. She explained that the total amount for local streets and roads in the 2004 RTP was derived from the controller's report. For the current 2007 RTP update, staff has gone back and taken out the component that it believes will go toward the really localized streets and roads as opposed to the regionally significant streets and roads. The methodology involves taking, for each county, a percentage of regionally significant roads and multiplying that against the controller's totals.

Bill McCullough, System Metrics, presented an updated report on the model results. In comparing the old SCAG model used for the 2004 RTP and the new model being used for the 2007 update, he noted significant differences in total delay. The total delay for 2003 base year (new model) is almost as much as the 2030 plan delay (old model). The old model also measured about 1.2 million hours for 2000 base year while the new model resulted in 2.6 million hours for 2003 base year. Mr. McCullough also noted comparative differences between AM and PM peak delay. PM peak period is defined in the new model as 3pm to 7pm and AM peak is defined as 6am to 9am. PM peak delay includes more hours. PM peak delay is generally double in total delay but our model results show triple the delay compared to AM peak hours.

Mr. McCullough stated that the new 2003 base year model and the 2030 baseline model are now available on the web for the committee to view. His presentation showed the difference between the 2003 and the 2030 models for both freeways and arterials. These models are structured differently in that there is no longer a Top 10 list or a 33% list.

Miles Mitchell, LADOT, asked if the segments identified through the needs assessment process have direct funding implications. Mr. Hatata stated that the TAC does not determine eligibility for funding and that the purpose is to identify problem areas. County level projects will be further analyzed later in the planning process to assess how well they perform in addressing the problem areas. This will eventually inform the alternatives development process to come.

Mr. McCullough noted that additional information is now available for review on the P&P TAC webpage and includes analysis of inter-regional segments.

Ms. Shiomoto-Lohr requested that the baseline needs assessment documents be clearly identifiable as such and should be noted in the header.

Mr. McCullough requested that TAC members review the data posted on the website and provide comments as necessary. Mr. Hatata stated that the intent was to reach consensus on 2003 base year at today's meeting and 2030 baseline at the next meeting in June.

Some discussion followed regarding potential differences in baseline emissions from the previous RTP to the current update.

Naresh Amatya, SCAG, announced that the next Modeling Task Force meeting will be taking place on May 22 at SCAG, where they will be discussing the new model validation report.

#### 4.4 Goods Movement

Sarah Catz, sub-consultant to System Metrics, presented the TAC with a brief overview on goods movement existing conditions. Ms. Catz stated that the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles account for 87% of California's container volume, with impacts to our regional, state and federal economies. Projections indicate continued robust growth but the infrastructure is reaching full capacity. The 2003 volume of 11.8 TEUs is projected to grow to 44.7 TEUs by 2030 for the two ports combined. There is also growing concern over the environmental and community impacts on the region due to the movement of goods.

Ms. Catz referred to a number of studies that have been conducted since the 2004 RTP in terms of goods movement issues. She continued by highlighting some of the findings from previous studies as follows:

- Largest National Container Port Complex
- Fifth Largest Container Port complex in the World
- 15.7 million Twenty-Foot Equivalent Units (TEUs) of containers in 2006
- Approximately 40,000 TEUs units move every day through the ports
- Over 70% of imports through the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach are destined for points outside of Southern California.

Ms. Catz discussed current freight rail volumes and the significant growth in passenger rail operations. She noted that the impact on delay incurred from this growth is forecasted to increase from 30 minutes of delay in 2000 to 206 minutes of delay in 2010. The rail side delay is in addition to the substantial highway delay increases from truck traffic which is projected to increase by 110% by 2025. Ms. Catz noted that the increase is specific to freight related truck volumes.

Ty Schuiling, SANBAG, commented on the importance of the CTCs and SCAG working together to leverage an increase to Prop 1B funding to the region in addressing goods movement issues.

David Mootchnik, Southern California Commuters Forum, commented that there is also a need to address impacts to the global warming issue from the region's CO2 emissions.

Miles Mitchell, LADOT, requested that staff provide the TAC with the goods movement related proposals to be included in the AQMP. Mr. Hatata stated that staff would relay the request in light of the upcoming meeting with the CTC CEOs.

#### 4.5 Congestion Mitigation Fee

*Due to time constraints this item was postponed for a future P&P TAC meeting.*

#### 4.6 RTP Revenue Model

Annie Nam, SCAG, presented the final draft baseline revenue forecast. She noted some minor adjustments to the gas tax for local streets and roads. Staff has met with LACMTA staff and has received input on their latest financial forecast which was incorporated into the baseline revenue model. Mitigation fee revenue estimates have also been updated for Riverside and San Bernardino counties. The revenue model is projecting \$212 billion over the 30 year time frame, which is the equivalent to \$413 billion in nominal dollars. The local share account for 70% of the revenues, 19% comes from state sources and an additional 11% from federal sources.

Ms. Nam presented on a slide the county-by-county breakdown of the total revenues for the region. She stated that there have been minimal changes since the 2004 RTP. Slight changes are attributed to the increased funding available from the sales tax extension measures and mitigation fees. Prop 1B and the gas tax revenues each represent 20% of the \$41 billion in state revenues which reflects the increase in state sources since the 2004 RTP.

Ms. Nam reported that federal sources total \$24 billion. FTA formula dollars represents the largest share from this category and is consistent with the 2004 RTP. Other categories include other federal categories and the highway bridge money.

Ty Schuiling, SANBAG, suggested that TAC have a discussion on the sales tax revenues forecast with respect to some of the assumptions applied for the various counties. Mr. Schuiling expressed concern over apparent inconsistencies with the forecast. Ms. Nam stated that there are inherent difficulties with doing regional forecasts. She stated that the sales tax forecast include data from economists hired by the county commissions and others who are utilizing the UCLA Anderson forecast.

Tarek Hatata, System Metrics, stated that staff will be presenting the revenue forecast to the TCC for approval and would require consensus from the TAC. Mr. Schuiling commented that the revenue forecast being reported for San Bernardino County was the equivalent of the county's sales tax forecast. Ms. Nam clarified that the figure in question was a simple comparison between what was forecasted for the 2004 RTP and the latest projections. She added that the forecast is available on the SCAG website for further review.

Miles Mitchell, LADOT, moved to amend the motion made earlier regarding the AQMP control measures to have staff provide the TAC written definition that distinguishes a transportation measure from a TCM. Mr. Mitchell stated that Rich Macias, SCAG, had stated to him that staff would agree to sending to TAC a summary of what a transportation measure and TCM are and their implications to the RTP. The motion was seconded by Mr. Schuiling and unanimously approved.

#### 4.7 RTP Security and Emergency Preparedness

*Due to time constraints this item was postponed until the next P&P TAC meeting.*



#### 4.8 Regional Transit Needs Assessment

*Due to time constraints this item was postponed until the next P&P TAC meeting.*

#### 4.9 RHNA Appeals

Hasan Ikhata, SCAG, provided an update on the RHNA appeals and revisions process. He reported that the board granted 7,851 units through the revisions. The units in question will not be redistributed by law. The hearing board has also granted 4,736 units through the appeals which will be distributed throughout the region except for those who have accepted delegation. The units will be redistributed proportionately based on the housing need. The specific details will be posted to the SCAG website. Mr. Ikhata thanked the TAC members for their participation and stated that staff is very pleased with the outcome. The draft numbers will be presented to the CEHD on June 7 for approval. Staff anticipates that the RC will approve the final distribution on July 13 and subsequently submit to HCD for state approval.

Gail Shiomoto-Lohr asked if there was still an opportunity for jurisdictions that did not get their appeals approved to pursue the trades and transfers process and if so, what the deadline is as to when the request submittals would be due to SCAG.

Joe Carreras, SCAG, stated that he will be signing the transmittal letters for the jurisdictions who have submitted a revision request or appeal. Staff will also be forwarding the written determination and assorted supplemental materials relating to their case. Successfully appeal units may be alternatively redistributed through a trade and transfer agreement. Every community in the region as well as the Regional Council will be advised of the opportunity before the final RHNA allocation is adopted by July 12. There is a form in the appeals procedures which defines the steps needed to take in order to affect a trade and transfer. There are a number of conditions that the Regional Council would have to approve and the final allocation plan would have to be consistent with their adopted policy. Mr. Carreras added that if interested jurisdictions do not affect the trade and transfer by July 5, the state housing laws would impose much more stringent conditions and requirements related to shifting the need between cities and counties to cities and so on. Staff will also have available for public review the written determinations as of May 14.

Carla Walecka, Transportation Corridor Agencies, asked if minor adjustments in the RHNA will not impact the RTP data set. Mr. Ikhata stated that it would not.

Ms. Walecka asked when the redistribution results from the successful appeals will be available. Mr. Carreras stated that staff is currently in the process of preparing the jurisdiction level adjustment results which should be available for public review in the next few days.

#### 4.10 Standing Item

##### 4.10.1 Highways & Arterials

*There was no report.*



4.10.2 Non-motorized / TDM

*There was no report.*

**5.0 STAFF REPORT**

*There was no report.*

**6.0 ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Ty Schuiling, adjourned the meeting at 12:20 pm. The next meeting of the Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee will be held at SCAG's Los Angeles office on May 31, 2007.